



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,503	09/15/2003	Yuji Hikawa	117186	7409
25944	7590	07/23/2007		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,503	HIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip C. Lee	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/17/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Objection

2. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities and grammar errors, page 3, line 1, “f”; page 10, line 1, “th”. Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities or grammar errors:
As per claim 3 (line 8), “the created indication data” should be “the indication data created”

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:
 - i. the associated processings – claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7;
 - ii. the basis of contents – claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7;
 - iii. the contents – claims 2 and 4;
 - b. Claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- iv. As per claim 1, lines 8, 11-12, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in lines 1-2 or “the associated processings” in lines 4-5.
- v. As per claim 2, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice form” refers to “a notice form” in claim 1, line 6 [if they are the same, then terms such as “the” or “said” should be used]; Line 2, it is unclear what is the term “it” referring to; Line 4, it is uncertain if “progress indicated by the indication data” refers to “progress of each of the processings in the job” in claim 1, line 8 [if they are the same, then terms such as “the” or “said” should be used].
- vi. As per claim 3, line 9, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in lines 1-2 or “the associated processings” in line 4.
- vii. As per claim 4, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice form” refers to “a notice form” in claim 1, line 6 [if they are the same, then terms such as “the” or “said” should be used]; Line 2, it is unclear what is the term “it” referring to; Line 4, it is uncertain if “progress indicated by the indication data” refers to “progress of each of the processings in the job” in claim 1, line 9 [if they are the same, then terms such as “the” or “said” should be used].
- viii. As per claim 5, line 9, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in lines 2-3 or “the associated processings” in lines 5-6.
- ix. As per claim 6, line 9, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in lines 2-3 or “the associated processings” in lines 5-6.

- x. As per claim 7, line 9, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in line 2 or “the associated processings” in lines 5-6.
- xi. As per claim 8, line 2, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in claim 6, lines 2-3 or “the associated processings” in claim 6, lines 5-6.
- xii. As per claim 9, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice” refers to “a notice” in claim 6, line 13; Line 2, it is unclear if “progress of the job” refers to “progress of each of the processings” in claim 6, line 9.
- xiii. As per claims 10-12, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice” refers to “a notice” in claim 6, line 13.
- xiv. As per claim 13, line 2, it is unclear if “the processings” refers to “specified multiple processings” in claim 7, line 2 or “the associated processings” in claim 6, lines 5-6.
- xv. As per claim 14, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice” refers to “a notice” in claim 7, line 12; Line 2, it is unclear if “progress of the job” refers to “progress of each of the processings” in claim 7, line 9.
- xvi. As per claims 15-17, line 2, it is unclear if “a notice” refers to “a notice” in claim 7, line 12.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

- 5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2152

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because “A service processing system” comprising “an indication data creation part”, “a management control part”, and “a notice part” (i.e., software) does not include any functional structure of a system (i.e., apparatus). “A service processing system” comprising “an indication data creation part”, “a management control part”, and “a notice part” (i.e., software) can be considered as an apparatus comprising software (i.e., program per se), which is not one of the categories of statutory subject matter.

7. Claims 5-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because “A device” comprising parts (i.e., software) does not include any functional structure of a system (i.e., apparatus). “A device” comprising parts (i.e., software) can be considered as an apparatus comprising software (i.e., program per se), which is not one of the categories of statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2152

9. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yaung, U.S. Patent 7,069,536 (hereinafter Yaung).

11. As per claim 1, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in which a service for performing specified multiple processings of document data is processed in a cooperative manner on a network (col. 4, lines 37-46), comprising: an indication data creation part that creates, for each job as a unit of the associated processings, indication data to indicate a processing procedure of the job (creates a workflow to define the sequence and the order in which the nodes are processed) (col. 5, lines 23-53; col. 7, lines 10-19), and notice condition data to indicate a notice event (to notify a user when not completed) (col. 6, lines 20-38) and a notice form thereof at each processing stage in the job (GUI panel for enabling notification at each processing node in the workflow) (figs 4 and 5; col. 6, lines 20-38); a management control part that manages progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the indication data created by the indication data creation part (manages the execution of processes for the workflow defined, manages processes and states, communicates with user of part of workflow) (col. 3, lines 32-38;

col. 7, lines 23-27, 34-36); and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the notice condition data (sending notification, col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 55-59).

12. As per claim 3, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in which a service for performing specified multiple processings of document data is processed in a cooperative manner on a network (col. 4, lines 37-46), comprising the steps of: creating, for each job as a unit of the associated processings, indication data to indicate a processing procedure of the job (creates a workflow to define the sequence and the order in which the nodes are processed) (col. 5, lines 23-53; col. 7, lines 10-19), and notice condition data to indicate a notice event (to notify a user when not completed) (col. 6, lines 20-38) and a notice form thereof at each processing stage in the job (GUI panel for enabling notification at each processing node in the workflow) (figs 4 and 5; col. 6, lines 20-38); managing progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the indication data created by the indication data creation part (manages the execution of processes for the workflow defined, manages processes and states, communicates with user of part of workflow) (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 7, lines 23-27, 34-36); and sending a notice during the progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the notice condition data (sending notification, col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 55-59).

13. As per claim 5, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed for managing progress of each of processings in a service processing system in which a service for performing specified multiple processings of document data is processed in a cooperative manner on a network (col. 4, lines

37-46), comprising: an indication data creation part that creates, for each job as a unit of the associated processings, indication data to indicate a processing procedure of the job (creates a workflow to define the sequence and the order in which the nodes are processed) (col. 5, lines 23-53; col. 7, lines 10-19), and notice condition data to indicate a notice event (to notify a user when not completed) (col. 6, lines 20-38) and a notice form thereof at each processing stage in the job (GUI panel for enabling notification at each processing node in the workflow) (figs 4 and 5; col. 6, lines 20-38); a management control part that manages progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the indication data created by the indication data creation part (manages the execution of processes for the workflow defined, manages processes and states, communicates with user of part of workflow) (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 7, lines 23-27, 34-36); and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the notice condition data (sending notification, col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 55-59).

14. As per claim 6, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed for managing progress of each of processings in a service processing system in which a service for performing specified multiple processings of document data is processed in a cooperative manner on a network (col. 4, lines 37-46), comprising: an indication data reception part that receives, for each job as a unit of the associated processings, indication data to indicate a processing procedure of the job (receives the sequence and the order in which the nodes are processed in a workflow) (col. 5, lines 23-53; col. 7, lines 10-19), and notice condition data to indicate a notice event (to notify a user when not completed) (col. 6, lines 20-38) and a notice form thereof at each processing stage in the job

Art Unit: 2152

(GUI panel for enabling notification at each processing node in the workflow) (figs 4 and 5; col. 6, lines 20-38); a management control part that manages progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the indication data received by the indication data reception part (manages the execution of processes for the workflow defined, manages processes and states, communicates with user of part of workflow) (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 7, lines 23-27, 34-36); and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the notice condition data (sending notification, col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 55-59).

15. As per claim 7, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed for processing a service in a service processing system in which a service for performing specified multiple processings of document data is processed in a cooperative manner on a network (col. 4, lines 37-46), comprising: an indication data reception part that receives, for each job as a unit of the associated processings, indication data to indicate a processing procedure of the job (receives the sequence and the order in which the nodes are processed in a workflow) (col. 5, lines 23-53; col. 7, lines 10-19), and notice condition data to indicate a notice event (to notify a user when not completed) (col. 6, lines 20-38) and a notice form thereof at each processing stage in the job (GUI panel for enabling notification at each processing node in the workflow) (figs 4 and 5; col. 6, lines 20-38); a management control part that manages progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the indication data received by the indication data reception part (manages the execution of processes for the workflow defined, manages processes and states, communicates with user of part of workflow) (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 7, lines 23-27, 34-36); and

Art Unit: 2152

a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of each of the processings in the job on the basis of contents recited in the notice condition data (sending notification, col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 55-59).

16. As per claims 2 and 4, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 3 above. Yaung further teach comprising a notice form change part that can change a notice form so that it differs from the contents recited in the notice condition data in a case where a specific user performs progress different from progress indicated by the indication data (the notification setting for each node in the workflow must be changed (e.g., deleted) when a user modified the defined workflow (e.g., deleting or changing a node from workflow) (i.e., in the case user performs progress different from progress indicated by the indication data)) (col. 12, lines 11-15, 40-48).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

18. Claims 8, 12, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of Ouchi, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0061266 (hereinafter Ouchi).

19. As per claims 8 and 13, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 7 above. Yaung does not teach gives notice of execution completion. Ouchi teaches gives notice of execution completion when the processing of the job is completed ([0032]).

20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yaung and Ouchi because Ouchi's teaching of notice of execution completion would enhance the notification mechanism in Yaung's system by providing notification of task progress or completion in a workflow.

21. As per claims 12 and 17, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 7 above. Yaung does not teach sends a notice in a case where a pay server or service is about to be executed. Ouchi teaches sends a notice in a case where a pay server or service is about to be executed ([0033]).

22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yaung and Ouchi because Ouchi's teaching of notice in a case where a pay server or service is about to be executed would enhance the notification mechanism in Yaung's system by providing notification of task progress or completion in a workflow.

23. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of Tarumi et al, U.S. Patent 5,918,226 (hereinafter Tarumi).

24. As per claims 9 and 14, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 7 above. Yaung does not teach notice in a case where progress different from progress of the job recited in the indication data occurs. Tarumi teaches sending a notice in a case where progress different from progress of the job recited in the indication data occurs (col. 25, lines 38-49).

25. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yaung and Tarumi because Tarumi's teaching of sending a notice in a case where progress different from progress of the job recited in the indication data occurs would enhance the notification mechanism in Yaung's system by providing notification of task progress or completion in a workflow.

26. Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of Ghaffar, U.S. Patent 7,200,860 (hereinafter Ghaffar).

27. As per claims 10 and 15, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 7 above. Yaung does not teach sends a notice in a case where an access to a file for a secret document occurs. Ghaffar teaches sending a notice in a case where an access to a file for a secret document occurs (col. 4, lines 8-19).

28. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yaung and Ghaffar because Ghaffar's teaching of sending a notice in a case where an access to a file for a secret document occurs would increase the security of Yaung's system by displaying a warning of an unauthorized access attempt to system operator.

29. Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of Palekar et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0005229 (hereinafter Palekar).

30. As per claims 11 and 16, Yaung teaches the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 7 above. Yaung does not teach sends a notice in a case where login to a specified server occurs. Palekar teaches sending a notice in a case where login to a specified server occurs ([0033]).

31. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yaung and Palekar because Palekar's teaching of sending a notice in a case where login to a specified server occurs would increase the security of Yaung's system by providing login information as a notification in order to determine user's permission to access a server.

CONCLUSION

Art Unit: 2152

32. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kim et al, US 7,168,077; Ankireddipally et al, US 6,772,216; Georgakopoulos et al, US 2002/0055849; Li et al, US 5,596,750

33. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P.L.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Philip C Lee".